

ORIGINAL



0000074177

Arizona Corporation Commission

RECEIVED

DOCKETED

BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

2007 JUN 22 P 3:55

JUN 22 2007

MIKE GLEASON  
Chairman

WILLIAM MUNDELL  
Commissioner

JEFF HATCH-MILLER  
Commissioner

KRISTIN MAYES  
Commissioner

GARY PIERCE  
Commissioner

AZ CORP COMMISSION  
DOCKET CONTROL

DOCKETED BY

ne

T-03632A-06-0091  
T-03406A-06-0091  
T-03267A-06-0091  
T-03432A-06-0091  
T-04302A-06-0091  
T-01051B-06-0091

IN THE MATTER QWEST CORPORATION'S  
APPLICATION FOR APPROVAL OF 2007  
ADDITIONS TO NON-IMPAIRED WIRE  
CENTER LIST AND MOTION FOR  
EXPEDITED ISSUANCE OF PROTECTIVE  
ORDER

DOCKET NOS.

QWEST CORPORATION'S  
APPLICATION FOR APPROVAL OF  
2007 ADDITIONS TO NON-  
IMPAIRED WIRE CENTER LIST AND  
MOTION FOR EXPEDITED  
ISSUANCE OF PROTECTIVE ORDER

Qwest Corporation ("Qwest") hereby requests that the Arizona Corporation Commission ("Commission") open a docket for approval of Qwest's 2007 additions to its non-impaired wire center list, as set forth in the joint settlement agreement between Qwest and a coalition of CLECs ("the Joint CLECs") that Qwest has concurrently filed for Commission approval in the Commission's initial *TRRO* non-impaired wire center proceeding, Docket Nos. T-03632A-06-0091, T-03406A-06-0091, T-03267A-06-0091, T-03432A-06-0091, T-04302A-06-0091, and T-01051B-06-0091 (the "First Wire Center Docket"). In addition, pursuant to the aforementioned settlement agreement filed for approval in the First Wire Center Docket, Qwest requests that the Commission issue on an expedited basis a protective order based on the model protective order attached hereto as Attachment A. In the First Wire Center Docket, Qwest and the Joint CLECs negotiated and agreed to this protective order in order to allow Qwest to file confidential wire center information regarding "business line" counts, and the number of "fiber-based collocators"

1 as defined in the FCC's *Triennial Review Remand Order* ("TRRO")<sup>1</sup> and in the settlement  
2 agreement filed for approval in the First Wire Center Docket.

### 4 INTRODUCTION AND PERTINENT BACKGROUND

6 On February 15, 2006, the Joint CLECs submitted a letter to the Commission requesting  
7 a proceeding for the purpose of determining the business line counts and numbers of collocators  
8 in Arizona wire centers, explaining that these determinations are necessary to implement the  
9 FCC's rulings in the *TRRO* relating to unbundled dedicated transport and high-capacity loops.  
10 The Commission docketed this request as docket nos. T-03632A-06-0091, T-03406A-06-0091,  
11 T-03267A-06-0091, T-03432A-06-0091, T-04302A-06-0091, and T-01051B-06-0091. Qwest  
12 then filed a response on February 28, 2006, and agreed that a proceeding for these and other  
13 related purposes was necessary, but also described how Qwest differed from the CLECs in some  
14 respects concerning the nature of the proceeding and the issues the Commission should address.  
15 The primary purpose of the First Wire Center Docket was for the Commission to determine the  
16 quantities of business lines and fiber collocators in Arizona wire centers so that carriers can  
17 implement the Section 251(d)(2) impairment standards set forth in the FCC's *TRRO* for high-  
18 capacity dedicated transport and loops. The docket also addressed other issues and disputes  
19 relating to the *TRRO*, including the process for identifying and adding in the future new wire  
20 centers to the non-impaired wire center list. The parties filed testimony on these issues and a  
21 hearing was scheduled.

22 Subsequently, as a result of settlement discussions between Qwest and the Joint CLECs  
23 throughout the Qwest region, and at the parties' requests, the Commission vacated the scheduled  
24

---

25 <sup>1</sup> Order on Remand, *In the Matter of Review of Unbundled Access to Network Elements, Review*  
26 *of Section 251 Unbundling Obligations of Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers*, CC Docket No.  
01-338, WC Docket No. 04-313 (FCC rel. February 4, 2005) (hereafter "*Triennial Review*  
*Remand Order*" or "*TRRO*").

1 hearing, and ordered that the settlement agreement be filed.

2  
3 **SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT FILED WITH COMMISSION AND REQUEST FOR**  
4 **ADDITIONS TO NON-IMPAIRED WIRE CENTER**

5  
6 Qwest and the Joint CLECs recently negotiated and executed a settlement agreement in  
7 the First Wire Center Docket that addresses all issues in that docket and the other *TRRO* wire  
8 center dockets in Qwest's region.<sup>2</sup> Qwest has filed the settlement agreement in the First  
9 Wire Center Docket concurrently with this filing, and the parties in that docket (Qwest and the  
10 Joint CLECs) seek Commission approval of the agreement. As set forth in the settlement  
11 agreement that has been submitted for Commission approval in First Wire Center Docket the  
12 parties to the settlement agreement agree that Qwest may request the addition of non-impaired  
13 wire centers based in whole or in part upon line counts at any time up to *July 1st* of each year,  
14 based on prior year line count data, and using an agreed-upon methodology.<sup>3</sup> The parties to the  
15 settlement agreement also agreed that at least *five (5) business days prior to filing* new non-  
16 impairment or tier designations for Commission review, Qwest will request a *protective order*  
17 from the Commission to govern the handling of confidential information during this new non-  
18 impairment proceeding. The parties also agree to seek from the Commission approval of a  
19 standing protective order, which is a new protective order, based on an agreed-upon model  
20 protective order.<sup>4</sup> Qwest is attaching the agreed model protective order as Attachment A to this

21  
22 <sup>2</sup> Some or all of the Joint CLECs were parties to similar Joint CLEC filings at the state utility  
23 regulatory commissions in Colorado (Docket No. 06M-080T), Minnesota (Docket Nos. P-5692,  
24 5340, 5643, 5323, 465, 6422/M-06-211), Oregon (Docket No. UM 1251), and Utah (Docket No.  
25 06-049-40). The Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission (WUTC) investigated  
26 Qwest's initial non-impairment list in an existing docket (number UT-053025) established to  
review the impacts of the *TRRO* on local competition

<sup>3</sup> With respect to fiber-based collocators, Qwest may request the addition of non-impaired wire  
centers to the Commission-approved wire center list at any time based on the number of fiber-  
based collocators.

<sup>4</sup> The Commission Staff has not yet agreed to the model protective order.

1 petition.

2 Consistent with this process and the requirements of the settlement agreement, Qwest intends to  
3 file with the Commission, on Friday, June 29, 2007, the data supporting its list of additional non-  
4 impaired wire centers, along with a request for Commission approval of the list. Assuming that  
5 the Commission has issued the protective order described above by that date, Qwest also will  
6 provide the data supporting the updated list to all CLECs that have signed the protective order.  
7 To facilitate this process and to comply with the requirement in the settlement agreement that it  
8 seek Commission approval of a protective order at least five business days prior to filing changes  
9 to the list, Qwest now seeks the Commission's expedited issuance of either a standing protective  
10 order or a new protective order based on the model protective order attached as Attachment A.  
11 Expedited issuance of the protective order will permit CLECs that sign the order to begin  
12 reviewing the confidential wire center data promptly after Qwest files the data on June 29.  
13 The wire centers Qwest is seeking to add to the list of non-impaired wire centers based on the  
14 confidential data it will file on June 29 are as follows:

15	Chandler Main	CHNDAZMA	Tier 2	DS3 Transport & DF
16	Chandler West	CHNDAZWE	Tier 2	DS3 Transport & DF
16	Phoenix Cactus	PHNXAZCA	Tier 2	DS3 Transport & DF
17	Phoenix Greenway	PHNXAZGR	Tier 2	DS3 Transport & DF
17	Phoenix Southeast	PHNXAZSE	Tier 1	DS1 and DS3 Transport & DF
18	Phoenix Sunnyslope	PHNXAZSY	Tier 2	DS3 Transport & DF
18	Phoenix West	PHNXAZWE	Tier 2	DS3 Transport & DF
19	Superstition West	SPRSAZWE	Tier 2	DS3 Transport & DF

20  
21 **REASON FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER**  
22

23 Finally, the reason a protective order is needed in this new proceeding is that the  
24 information Qwest will file will include certain highly-confidential wire center data, including  
25 highly-confidential CLEC-specific data. Qwest and the joint CLECs in the First Wire Center  
26 Docket have agreed these data should be protected by a protective order that contains protections

1 and limited disclosures of highly-confidential information. Specifically, Qwest seeks this  
2 protective order because Qwest will be filing CLEC-specific wire center data in this proceeding  
3 for the purposes of counting business line counts and fiber-based collocators in specific wire  
4 centers, and because the parties in the First Wire Center Docket agree a protective order is  
5 needed here.

6 Accordingly, Qwest submits with this petition the model protective order that the parties  
7 in First Wire Center Docket agreed to in their settlement agreement. The model protective order  
8 (which was attachment E to the Settlement) is attached hereto, marked as Attachment A. Qwest  
9 respectfully requests that the Commission issue either a standing protective order base on  
10 Attachment A, or a new protective order, based on Attachment A as soon as possible.  
11 Alternatively, Qwest notes that the Commission previously issued a protective order in the First  
12 Wire Center Docket, that the Commission may wish to consider in this new proceeding.

### 13 14 CONCLUSION

15  
16 Accordingly, for the reasons set forth above, Qwest respectfully requests that the  
17 Commission open a docket for approval of Qwest's 2007 additions to its non-impaired wire  
18 center list listed above for which Qwest will file supporting data on June 29, 2007, and that it  
19 issue a protective order, based on the model protective order in Attachment A, as soon as  
20 possible.

21 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 22nd day of June, 2007.

22 QWEST CORPORATION

23  
24 By: 

25 Norman G. Curtright  
26 Corporate Counsel  
20 East Thomas Road, 16<sup>th</sup> Floor

Phoenix, Arizona 85012  
Telephone: (602) 630-2187

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26

1 ORIGINAL and 13 copies hand-delivered  
2 for filing this 22nd day of June, 2007, to:

3 Docket Control  
4 ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION  
5 1200 West Washington Street  
6 Phoenix, AZ 85007

7 COPY of the foregoing hand delivered  
8 this 22nd day of June, 2007, to:

9 Dwight D. Nodes  
10 Assistant Chief Administrative Law Judge  
11 Arizona Corporation Commission  
12 1200 West Washington Street  
13 Phoenix, AZ 95012

14 Maureen A. Scott, Esq.  
15 Legal Division  
16 ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION  
17 1200 W. Washington Street  
18 Phoenix, AZ 85007

19 Christopher Kempley, Chief Counsel  
20 Legal Division  
21 Arizona Corporation Commission  
22 1200 W. Washington Street  
23 Phoenix, AZ 85007

24 Ernest Johnson, Director  
25 Utilities Division  
26 Arizona Corporation Commission  
1200 West Washington Street  
Phoenix, AZ 85007

COPY of the foregoing mailed  
this 22nd day of June, 2007, to

Michael W. Patten  
Roshka DeWulf & Patten, PLC  
One Arizona Center  
400 East Van Buren Street, Suite 800  
Phoenix, AZ 85004

Greg Diamond  
Covad Communications Company  
Senior Counsel  
7901 E. Lowry Boulevard  
Denver, CO 80230

1 Douglas Denney  
2 Senior Director Interconnection/  
3 Senior Attorney  
4 Eschelon Telecom, Inc.  
5 730 Second Avenue S., Suite 900  
6 Minneapolis, MN 55402-2489


5 Mike Hazel  
6 Mountain Telecommunications  
7 1430 West Broadway, Suite 206  
8 Tempe, AZ 85282

8 Gary Joseph, Vice President  
9 National Brands, Inc.  
10 dba Sharenet Communications Company  
11 4633 W. Polk Street  
12 Phoenix, AZ 85043

11

12

13

  
\_\_\_\_\_

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

William Haas  
Regulatory Contact  
McLeodUSA Telecommunications  
Services, Inc.  
6400 C Street SW  
P.O. Box 3177  
Cedar Rapids, IA 52406-3177

Rex Knowles  
Regulatory Contact  
XO Communications Services  
111 East Broadway, Suite 1000  
Salt Lake City, UT 84111



# **ATTACHMENT A**



ATTACHMENT E  
STATE OF MINNESOTA  
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS  
100 Washington Square, Suite 1700  
100 Washington Avenue South  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55401-2138

TELEPHONE: (612) 341-7600  
TTY: (612) 341-7346

VIA E-MAIL AND U.S. MAIL

June 28, 2006

29

To: All Parties on the Attached Service List

Re: *In the Matter of CLECS' Request for Commission  
Approval of ILEC Wire Center Impairment Analysis*  
PUC Docket Nos. P-5692, 5340, 5643, 5323, 465, 6422/M-06-211

and

*In the Matter of a Commission Investigation Identifying  
Wire Centers in which Qwest Corporation Must Offer  
High-Capacity Loop or Transport UNEs at Cost-Based  
Rates*  
PUC Docket No. P-999/CI-06-685

OAH Docket No. 11-2500-17274-2

Based upon recent e-mail communications from counsel in this matter, it is my understanding that the parties all concur in the use of the draft Protective Order I sent you last week. Accordingly, I have signed that Protective Order, and a copy is hereby served upon each of you.

Sincerely,

*Barbara L. Neilson*

BARBARA L. NEILSON  
Administrative Law Judge  
Telephone: (612) 341-7604

Encl.

---

Providing Impartial Hearings for Government and Citizens  
An Equal Opportunity Employer

---

Administrative Law Division & Administrative Services  
Facsimile: (612) 349-2665

Workers' Compensation Hearings Division  
Facsimile: (612) 349-2691

Workers' Compensation Settlement Division  
Facsimile: (612) 349-2634

OAH Docket No. 11-2500-17274-2  
MPUC Docket No. P-5692, 5340, 5323, 465, 6422/M-06-211  
MPUC Docket No. P-999/CI-06-685

**In the Matter of CLECs' Request for Commission Approval  
of ILEC Wire Center Impairment Analysis  
and**

**In the Matter of a Commission Investigation Identifying  
Wire Centers in which Qwest Corporation Must Offer  
High-Capacity Loop or Transport UNEs at Cost-Based Rates**

**Administrative Law Judge's Service List as of June 28, 2006**

**Commission and Administrative Law Judge**

Dr. Burl W. Haar (15)  
Executive Secretary  
Public Utilities Commission  
Suite 350  
121 Seventh Place East  
St. Paul, MN 55101-2147

John J. Lindell  
Analyst  
Public Utilities Commission  
Suite 350  
121 Seventh Place East  
St. Paul, MN 55101-2147

Barbara L. Neilson (Original)  
Office of Administrative  
Hearings  
Suite 1700  
100 Washington Square  
Minneapolis, MN 55401-2138

**Parties**

Linda Chavez (4)  
Telephone Docketing  
Coordinator  
Department of Commerce  
Suite 500  
85 Seventh Place East  
St. Paul, MN 55101-2198

Karen A. Finstad Hammel  
Assistant Attorney General  
Suite 1500  
445 Minnesota Street  
St. Paul, MN 55101

Joan C. Peterson  
Jason D. Topp  
Corporate Counsel  
Qwest Corporation  
Room 2200  
200 South Fifth Street  
Minneapolis, MN 55402

Dan Lipschultz  
Attorney at Law  
Moss & Barnett, P.A.  
Suite 4800  
90 South Seventh Street  
Minneapolis, MN 55402-4129

Joy Gullikson  
Corporate Counsel  
Onvoy, Inc.  
Suite 700  
300 South Highway 169  
Minneapolis, MN 55426

Mary T. Buley  
Sr. Regulatory Manager  
Onvoy, Inc.  
Suite 700  
300 South Highway 169  
Minneapolis, MN 55426

**Court Reporter**

Janet Shaddix Elling  
Shaddix & Associates  
Suite 122  
9100 W. Bloomington  
Freeway  
Bloomington, MN 55431

**Email service list**  
**Parties**

burl.haar@state.mn.us  
john.lindell@state.mn.us  
barbara.neilson@state.mn.us  
karen.hammel@state.mn.us  
linda.chavez@state.mn.us  
joan.peterson@qwest.com  
jason.topp@qwest.com  
LipschultzD@moss-barnett.com  
joy.gullikson@onvoy.com  
mary.buley@onvoy.com

**Court Reporter**

jshaddix@janetshaddix.com

**STATE OF MINNESOTA  
BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION**

LeRoy Koppendraye	Chair
Marshall Johnson	Commissioner
Phyllis A. Reha	Commissioner
Kenneth A. Nickolai	Commissioner
Thomas Pugh	Commissioner

In the Matter of CLECs' Request for  
Commission Approval of ILEC Wire Center  
Impairment Analysis

MPUC Docket No. P-5692, 5340,  
5643, 5323, 465, 6422/M-06-211

In the Matter of a Commission  
Investigation Identifying Wire Centers in  
which Qwest Corporation Must Offer High-  
Capacity Loop or Transport UNEs at Cost-  
Based Rates

MPUC Docket No. P-999/CI-06-685

OAH Docket No. 11-2500-17274-2

---

**PROTECTIVE ORDER**

---

The purpose of this Protective Order ("Order") is to facilitate the disclosure of documents and information during the course of these proceedings and to protect Confidential Information and Highly Confidential Information. Access to and review of Confidential Information and Highly Confidential Information by parties other than government agencies shall be strictly controlled by the terms of this Order. The parties other than government agencies have represented and agree that Confidential Information and Highly Confidential Information as defined in this Order constitute "trade secret information" under Minn. Stat. § 13.37, subd. 1(b), and "nonpublic data" under Minn. Stat. § 13.02, subd. 9. The parties other than government agencies have

acknowledged that the government agencies involved in this docket, which include the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission ("Commission"), the Office of Administrative Hearings ("OAH"), the Minnesota of Commerce ("Department"), and the Office of Attorney General ("OAG") and Office of Attorney General-Residential and Small Business Utilities Division ("OAG-RUD") are subject to the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act ("MGDPA")<sup>1</sup> and records retention requirements of Minn. Stat. §§ 138.163-138.226. The parties other than government agencies, which parties are hereinafter referred to as "parties", "persons" or "entities" have further agreed to the terms of paragraphs one through twelve below, and, upon that agreement, and all the files, records and proceedings herein, it is hereby ordered:

1. (a) Confidential Information. All documents, data, studies and other materials furnished pursuant to any requests for information, subpoenas or other modes of discovery (formal or informal), and including depositions, and other requests for information, that are claimed to be of a trade secret, proprietary or confidential nature (herein referred to as "Confidential Information"), shall be so marked by the providing party by stamping the same with a "NONPUBLIC DOCUMENT – CONTAINS TRADE SECRET DATA" designation. All copies of documents so marked shall be made on yellow paper. In addition, all notes or other materials that refer to, derive from, or otherwise contain parts of the Confidential Information will be marked by the receiving party as "NONPUBLIC DOCUMENT – CONTAINS TRADE SECRET DATA." Access to and review of Confidential Information shall be strictly controlled by the terms of this Order.

---

<sup>1</sup> Minn. Stat. Chapter 13.

(b) Use of Confidential Information – Proceedings. All persons who may be entitled to review, or who are afforded access to any Confidential Information by reason of this Order shall neither use nor disclose the Confidential Information for purposes of business or competition, or any purpose other than the purpose of preparation for and conduct of proceeding in the above-captioned docket or before the Federal Communications Commission ("FCC"), and all subsequent appeals ("proceedings"), and shall keep the Confidential Information secure as trade secret, confidential or proprietary information and in accordance with the purposes, intent and requirements of this Order.

(c) Persons Entitled to Review. Each party that receives Confidential Information pursuant to this Order must limit access to such Confidential Information to (1) attorneys employed or retained by the party in proceedings and the attorneys' staff; (2) experts, consultants and advisors who need access to the material to assist the party in proceedings; (3) only those employees of the party who are directly involved in these proceedings, provided that counsel for the party represents that no such employee is engaged in the sale or marketing of that party's products or services. In addition, access to Confidential Information may be provided to the government agencies, their counsel, employees, consultants and experts.

(d) Nondisclosure Agreement. Any party, person, or entity that receives Confidential Information pursuant to this Order shall not disclose such Confidential Information to any person, except persons who are described in section 1(c) above and who have signed a nondisclosure agreement in the form which is attached hereto and incorporated herein as Exhibit A. Court reporters whose activities

are not regulated by Minn. Stat. Ch. 13 shall also be required to sign an Exhibit A upon written request of a party and to comply with the terms of this Order.

The nondisclosure agreement (Exhibit A) shall require the person(s) to whom disclosure is to be made to read a copy of this Protective Order and to certify in writing that they have reviewed the same and have consented to be bound by its terms. The nondisclosure agreement shall contain the signatory's full name, employer, business address and the name of the party with whom the signatory is associated. Such agreement shall be delivered to counsel for the providing party before disclosure is made, and if no objection thereto is registered to the Commission within five (5) days, then disclosure shall follow. An attorney who makes Confidential Information available to any person listed in section 1(c) above shall be responsible for having each such person execute an original of Exhibit A and a copy of all such signed Exhibit As shall be circulated to all other counsel of record promptly after execution.

2. (a) Notes. Limited notes regarding Confidential Information may be taken by counsel and experts for the express purpose of preparing pleadings, cross-examinations, briefs, motions and arguments in connection with this proceeding, or in the case of persons designated in section 1(c) of this Protective Order, to prepare for participation in this proceeding. Such notes shall then be treated as Confidential Information for purposes of this Order, and shall be destroyed after the final settlement or conclusion of the proceedings in accordance with section 2(b) below.

(b) Destruction. All notes, to the extent they contain Confidential Information and are protected by the attorney-client privilege or the work product doctrine, shall be destroyed after the final settlement or conclusion of the proceedings.



The party destroying such Confidential Information shall advise the providing party of that fact within a reasonable time from the date of destruction.

3. Highly Confidential Trade Secret Information. Any person, whether a party or non-party, may designate certain competitive Confidential Information as "Highly Confidential Trade Secret Information" (herein referred to as "Highly Confidential Information") if it determines in good faith that it would be competitively disadvantaged by the disclosure of such information to its competitors. Highly Confidential Information includes, but is not limited to, documents, pleadings, briefs and appropriate portions of deposition transcripts, which contain information regarding the market share of, number of access lines served by, or number of customers receiving a specified type of service from a particular provider or other information that relates to marketing, business planning or business strategies.

Parties must scrutinize carefully responsive documents and information and limit their designations as Highly Confidential Information to information that truly might impose a serious business risk if disseminated without the heightened protections provided in this section. The first page and individual pages of a document determined in good faith to include Highly Confidential Information must be marked by a stamp that reads:

NONPUBLIC HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL TRADE SECRET  
INFORMATION—USE RESTRICTED PER PROTECTIVE ORDER  
IN MPUC DOCKET NOS. P-5692, 5340, 5643, 5323, 465, 6422/M-06-211  
AND P-999/CI-06-685

Placing a "Highly Confidential" stamp on the first page of a document indicates only that one or more pages contain Highly Confidential Information and will not serve to protect the entire contents of a multi-page document. Each page that contains Highly

Confidential Information must be marked separately to indicate Highly Confidential Information, even where that information has been redacted. The redacted versions of each page containing Highly Confidential Information, and provided under seal, should be submitted on paper distinct in color from non-confidential information and Confidential Information described in section 1 of this Protective Order.

Parties seeking disclosure of Highly Confidential Information must designate the person(s) to whom they would like the Highly Confidential Information disclosed in advance of disclosure by the providing party. Such designation may occur through the submission of Exhibit B of the nondisclosure agreement identified in section 1(d). Parties seeking disclosure of Highly Confidential Information shall not designate more than (1) a reasonable number of in-house attorneys who have direct responsibility for matters relating to Highly Confidential Information; (2) five in-house experts; and (3) a reasonable number of outside counsel and outside experts to review materials marked as Highly Confidential. Disclosure of Highly Confidential Information to Commissioners, Hearing Officers and Commission Advisory Staff members shall be limited to persons to whom disclosure is necessary. The Exhibit B also shall describe in detail the duties or responsibilities of the person being designated to see Highly Confidential Information and the person's role in the proceeding. Highly Confidential Information may not be disclosed to persons engaged in strategic or competitive decision making for any party, including the sale or marketing of products or services on behalf of any party.

Any party providing either Confidential Information or Highly Confidential Information may object to the designation of any individual as a person who may review Confidential Information and/or Highly Confidential Information. Such objection shall be

made in writing to counsel submitting the challenged individual's Exhibit A or B within three (3) business days after receiving the challenged individual's signed Exhibit A or B. Any such objection must demonstrate good cause to exclude the challenged individual from the review of the Highly Confidential Information. Written response to any objection shall be made within three (3) business days after receipt of an objection. If, after receiving a written response to a party's objection, the objecting party still objects to disclosure of either Confidential Information or Highly Confidential Information to the challenged individual, the Commission shall determine whether Confidential Information or Highly Confidential Information must be disclosed to the challenged individual.

Copies of Highly Confidential Information may be provided to the in-house attorneys, in-house consultants, outside counsel and outside experts who have signed Exhibit B, and to the Department and OAG-RUD, their employees and counsel, and to their consultants and experts who have signed Exhibit B.

Persons authorized to review the Highly Confidential Information will maintain the documents and any notes reflecting their contents in a secure location to which only designated counsel and experts have access. No additional copies will be made, except for use during hearings and then such disclosure and copies shall be subject to the provisions of this Order. Any testimony or exhibits prepared that reflect Highly Confidential Information must be maintained in a secure location until removed to the hearing room for production under seal. Unless specifically addressed in this section, all other sections of this Protective Order applicable to Confidential Information also apply to Highly Confidential Information.

4. Small Company. Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in this Order,

persons authorized to review Confidential Information and Highly Confidential Information on behalf of a company with less than 5,000 employees shall be limited to the following: (1) a reasonable number of in-house attorneys who have direct responsibility for matters relating to Highly Confidential Information; (2) a reasonable number of outside counsel; (3) the company's employees and witnesses; and (4) independent consultants acting under the direction of the company's counsel or senior management and directly engaged in this proceeding. Such persons do not include individuals primarily involved in marketing activities for the company, unless the party producing the information, upon request, gives prior written authorization for that person to review the Confidential Information or Highly Confidential Information. If the producing party refuses to give such written authorization, the company may, for good cause shown, request an order from the Administrative Law Judge ("ALJ") allowing that person to review the Confidential Information or Highly Confidential Information. The producing party shall be given the opportunity to respond to the company's request before an order is issued.

5. Masking. Information or documents provided in this proceeding showing the identity of any fiber-based collocators in a wire center must be designated as Confidential. Similarly, any information or documents provided in this proceeding showing the identity of a telecommunications carrier's business lines or line counts must be provided in a "masked" format, identifying the information using a code, and must be designated as Confidential. Each individual carrier will be provided its own code to verify data concerning that carrier. The government agencies will be provided a code for each carrier identified in the information or documents provided.

6. Objections to Admissibility. The furnishing of any document, data, study or other materials pursuant to this Protective Order shall in no way limit the right of the providing party to object to its relevance or admissibility in proceedings before this Commission.

7. Challenge to Confidentiality. This Order establishes a procedure for the expeditious handling of information that a party claims is Confidential or Highly Confidential. It shall not be construed as an agreement or ruling on the confidentiality of any document. Any party may challenge the characterization of any information, document, data or study claimed by the providing party to be Confidential in the following manner:

(a) A party seeking to challenge the confidentiality of any materials pursuant to this Order shall first contact counsel for the providing party and attempt to resolve any differences by stipulation;

(b) In the event that the parties cannot agree as to the character of the information challenged, any party challenging the confidentiality shall do so by appropriate pleading. This pleading shall:

(i) Designate the document, transcript or other material challenged in a manner that will specifically isolate the challenged material from other material claimed as confidential; and

(ii) State with specificity the grounds upon which the documents, transcript or other material are deemed to be non-confidential by the challenging party.

(c) A ruling on the confidentiality of the challenged information,

document, data or study shall be made by a Hearing Officer after proceedings in camera, which shall be conducted under circumstances such that only those persons duly authorized hereunder to have access to such Confidential materials shall be present. This hearing shall commence no earlier than five (5) business days after service on the providing party of the pleading required by section 7(b) above.

(d) The record of said in camera hearing shall be marked "CONFIDENTIAL – SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER IN MPUC DOCKET NOS. P-5692, 5340, 5643, 5323, 465, 6422/M-06-211 AND P-999/CI-06-685." Court reporter notes of such hearing shall be transcribed only upon agreement by the parties or order of the Hearing Officer and in that event shall be separately bound, segregated, sealed, and withheld from inspection by any person not bound by the terms of this Order.

(e) In the event that the Hearing Officer should rule that any information, document, data or study should be removed from the restrictions imposed by this Order, no party shall disclose such information, document, data or study or use it in the public record for five (5) business days unless authorized by the providing party to do so. The provisions of this subsection are intended to enable the providing party to seek a stay or other relief from an order removing the restriction of this Order from materials claimed by the providing party to be Confidential.

8. (a) Receipt into Evidence. Provision is hereby made for receipt into evidence in this proceeding materials claimed to be confidential in the following manner:

(i) Prior to the use of, or substantive reference to, any Confidential or Highly Confidential Information, the parties intending to use such information shall make that intention known to the providing party.

(ii) The requesting party and the providing party shall make a good-faith effort to reach an agreement so the information can be used in a manner which will not reveal its trade secret, confidential or proprietary nature.

(iii) If such efforts fail, the providing party shall separately identify which portions, if any, of the documents to be offered or referenced shall be placed in a sealed record.

(iv) Only one (1) copy of the documents designated by the providing party to be placed in a sealed record shall be made.

(v) The copy of the documents to be placed in the sealed record shall be tendered by counsel for the providing party to the Commission, and maintained in accordance with the terms of this Order.

(b) Seal. While in the custody of the Commission, materials containing Confidential Information shall be marked "CONFIDENTIAL – SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER IN MPUC DOCKET NOS. P-5692, 5340, 5643, 5323, 465, 6422/M-06-211 AND P-999/CI-06-685" and Highly Confidential Information shall be marked "HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – USE RESTRICTED PER PROTECTIVE ORDER IN MPUC DOCKET NOS. P-5692, 5340, 5643, 5323, 465, 6422/M-06-211 AND P-999/CI-06-685," and shall not be examined by any person except under the conditions set forth in this Order.

(c) In Camera Hearing. Any Confidential or Highly Confidential Information that must be orally disclosed to be placed in the sealed record in this proceeding shall be offered in an in camera hearing, attended only by persons authorized to have access to the information under this Order. Similarly, any cross-

examination on, or substantive reference to, Confidential or Highly Confidential Information (or that portion of the record containing Confidential or Highly Confidential Information or references thereto) shall be received in an in camera hearing, and shall be marked and treated as provided herein.

(d) Access to Record. Access to sealed testimony, records and information shall be limited to the Hearing Officer and persons who are entitled to review Confidential or Highly Confidential Information pursuant to section 1(c) above and have signed an Exhibit A or B, unless such information is released from the restrictions of this Order either through agreement of the parties or after notice to the parties and hearing, pursuant to the ruling of a Hearing Officer, the order of the Commission and/or final order of a court having final jurisdiction.

(e) Appeal/Subsequent Proceeding. Sealed portions of the record in this proceeding may be forwarded to any court of competent jurisdiction for purposes of an appeal, or to the FCC, but under seal as designated herein for the information and use of the court or the FCC. If a portion of the record is forwarded to a court or the FCC, the providing party shall be notified which portion of the sealed record has been designated by the appealing party as necessary to the record on appeal or for use at the FCC.

(f) Return. Unless otherwise ordered, Confidential Information and Highly Confidential Information, including transcripts of any depositions to which a claim of confidentiality is made, shall remain under seal, shall continue to be subject to the protective requirements of this Order, and shall be returned to counsel for the providing party within thirty (30) days after final settlement or conclusion of the proceedings. If the



providing party elects to have Confidential Information or Highly Confidential Information destroyed rather than returned, counsel of the receiving party shall verify in writing that the material has in fact been destroyed.


9. Use in Pleadings. Where references to Confidential or Highly Confidential Information in the sealed record or with the providing party is required in pleadings, briefs, arguments or motions (except as provided in section 7), it shall be by citation of title or exhibit number or some other description that will not disclose the substantive Confidential Information contained therein. Any use of or substantive references to Confidential or Highly Confidential Information shall be placed in a separate section of the pleading or brief and submitted to the Hearing Officer or the Commission under seal. This sealed section shall be served only on counsel of record and parties of record who have signed the nondisclosure agreement set forth in Exhibit A or B. All of the restrictions afforded by this Order apply to materials prepared and distributed under this section.

10. Summary of Record. If deemed necessary by the Commission or ALJ, the providing party shall prepare a written summary of the Confidential or Highly Confidential Information referred to in the Order to be placed on the public record.

11. The provisions of this Order are specifically intended to apply to all data, documents, studies, and other material designated as Confidential or Highly Confidential by any party to MPUC Docket Nos. P-5692, 5340, 5643, 5323, 465, 6422/M-06-211 and P-999/CI-06-685. In addition, experts and consultants of government agencies are subject to the provisions of this Protective Order that are applicable to experts and consultants of parties.

12. This Protective Order shall continue in force and effect after these dockets are closed.

Dated: June 28, 2006.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
BARBARA L. NEILSON  
Administrative Law Judge

**EXHIBIT A**

**CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION**

I have read the foregoing Protective Order dated \_\_\_\_\_ 2006, in MPUC  
Docket Nos. P-5692, 5340, 5643, 5323, 465, 6422/M-06-211 and P-999/CI-06-685P-  
421/CI-05-1996, and agree to be bound by the terms and conditions of this Order.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name

\_\_\_\_\_  
Employer

\_\_\_\_\_  
Job Title and Job Description

\_\_\_\_\_  
Business Address

\_\_\_\_\_  
Party

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

**EXHIBIT B**

**HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION**

I have read the foregoing Protective Order dated \_\_\_\_\_ 2006, in MPUC  
Docket Nos. P-5692, 5340, 5643, 5323, 465, 6422/M-06-211 AND P-999/CI-06-685,  
and agree to be bound by the terms and conditions of this Order.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name

\_\_\_\_\_  
Employer

\_\_\_\_\_  
Job Title and Job Description

\_\_\_\_\_  
Business Address

\_\_\_\_\_  
Party

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date